

1 On March 31, 2006 the Court issued an ORDER (Ct. Rec. 96)
2 requiring Plaintiffs to file an amended complaint complying with
3 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a) and 10. In this twenty-four
4 page court ORDER Plaintiffs were advised of numerous deficiencies in
5 their pleadings and were given until May 1, 2006 to file an amended
6 complaint containing a "short and plain statement" showing
7 entitlement to relief in accord with the Federal Rules of Civil
8 Procedure. The motions to dismiss filed by Defendants McMillen,
9 Hanes, Anderson and Whitlow were granted incidental to the ORDER.

10 Plaintiffs responded by filing a timely, 139-page amended
11 complaint titled "First Amended Complaint; Demand for Jury Trial;
12 Re-Issue of Summons, Rule 4 and 15" on April 25, 2006 (Ct. Rec. 98).
13 Plaintiffs' 139-page Amended Complaint ignored the dismissal order
14 involving the above named Defendants and added in excess of twenty
15 (20) additional parties. The additional parties included two judges
16 of this court (one of which is the undersigned judicial officer),
17 court personnel in the clerk's office, the defense attorneys and
18 defense law firms in this case, and numerous others.

19 Contrary to the directions provided in the earlier ORDER,
20 Plaintiffs did not correct their pleadings to recite facts showing
21 entitlement to relief. Instead, Plaintiffs reinstated and expanded
22 conclusory allegations with many pages referencing court rules,
23 statutes, and other materials which are not properly part of an
24 amended complaint. The Court finds that Plaintiffs' Amended
25

Complaint fails to correct few, if any, of the deficiencies recited in the ORDER. The Court finds Plaintiffs' conduct, in ignoring the Court's earlier ORDER, is willful by renaming certain defendants that were already dismissed through that ORDER. Plaintiffs' complaints are not only frivolous but indisputably "harassing" as plainly evidenced by the multitude of defendants named in each complaint, without any specific indication of how the "facts" alleged specifically relate to each defendant; and the numerous overlapping "claims" and defendants in the complaints.

IT IS ORDERED that the above-titled case be **DISMISSED with prejudice** and the file be closed in this matter.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pending motions be DENIED as MOOT.

The District Court Executive is directed to enter this Order; enter judgment; and provide a copy to all counsel and *pro se* Plaintiffs.

Dated this 9th day of May, 2006.

s/ Lonny R. Suko
LONNY R. SUKO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE